



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE EXPULSION OF THE JEWS FROM ENGLAND IN 1290.

(*Concluded from p. 258.*)

IX.—THE JEWS IN RELATION TO THE CHURCH OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

The Popes of the earlier part of the Middle Ages had found enough employment for their energies in the effort to maintain their own position in Christendom; and they had neither the wish nor the power to seek a conflict with a race that remained wholly outside the Church. In the twelfth century there was no other general Church Law directed against the Jews than that which forbade them to live in the same houses with Christians, and to have Christian servants.¹ In England especially, Churchmen of the twelfth century showed towards the Jews a tolerant spirit, and made no effort to augment their unpopularity or to diminish their privileges. The examples of Anselm, and of his contemporary, Gilbert of Westminster, show that in the attempts made at that time by men of high position in the Church to convert the Jews, no method was employed except that of reasonable persuasion.² Churches and monasteries took charge, at times of danger, of the money, and even of the families, of Jews. Such friendly intercourse as existed between Jews and Christians was allowed to go on without any attempt at ecclesiastical interference.³

¹ See the Decrees of the Third Lateran Council of 1179, Mansi, *Concilia*, XXII., 231.

² St. Anselm, *Epistolæ*, III., 117 (Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, Vol. 159, columns 153-155; Gilbert of Westminster, *Disputatio Judaica cum Christiano* (Ibid. 1005-1036).

³ *Chronicles of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I.* (Rolls Series), I.,

The accession of Innocent the Third to the pontificate brought about a rapid change in the attitude of the Church towards the Jews. Innocent was the first to advance, on behalf of the Papacy, the claim that the Lord gave Peter not only the whole Church, but the whole world to rule,¹ and he endeavoured with a merciless enthusiasm, from which all unbelievers and heretics in Christian countries had to suffer, to make good his claim, and to establish in Europe one united Catholic Church. He took his stand on the doctrine, which his predecessors had held² in a modified form, and without ever acting on it, that the Jews were condemned to perpetual slavery on account of the wickedness of their ancestors in crucifying Christ; and he thought that they ought to be made to feel, and their neighbours likewise, that it was only out of Christian pity that their presence was endured in Christian countries.

The position of the Jews at the time of Innocent's accession to the pontificate was very far from being such as his theory required. They had magnificent synagogues, they employed Christian servants, they married, or were said to marry, Christian wives; they refused, in what some Christians regarded as a spirit of outrageous insolence, to eat the same meat and to drink the same wine as the Gentiles, and they made no secret of their disbelief in the sacred

310 (among the victims of the massacre at Lynn in 1190 was *quidam Judæus, insignis medicus, qui et artis et modestiæ suæ gratia Christianis quoque familiaris et honorabilis fuerat*); Gervase of Canterbury (Rolls Series), I., 405. (The Jews help the monks of Canterbury in their struggle with the Archbishop in 1188); *Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum* (Record Commission), I., 20b. (*Rex, &c., domino Lincolnensi Episcopo, &c.: mandamus vobis quod non permittatis injuste catalle Judæorum receptari in ecclesiis in dioecesi vestra*, February 28th, 1205); *Chronica Jocelini de Brakelonde* (Camden Society), p. 33. (A.D. 1190, *Abbas jussit solempniter excommunicari illos qui de cetero receptarent Judeos vel in hospicio recipere in villa Santi Ædmundi*); Jacobs, *The Jews of Angevin England*, 269. ("English Jews drink with Gentiles.")

¹ Moeller, *History of the Christian Church, Middle Ages* (Eng. Tr.), p. 279.

² Mansi, *Concilia*, XXII. 231.

history of Christianity. Moreover, they were suspected of exercising a considerable influence on the growth of the heresies which it was the chief work of Innocent's life to combat. The Vaudois, the Cathari, and the Albigenses, all kept up Jewish observances, and were said to have learnt from the Jews their heretical dogmas; the Albigenses, indeed, were accused of maintaining that the law of the Jews was better than the law of the Christians. And, nevertheless, Christian kings supported the Jews in every way. They countenanced their usury, they refused (so, at least, Innocent said) to allow evidence against them on any charge to be given by Christian witnesses, and they even employed them in high offices of State. In view of these facts, Innocent thought that a great effort of repression should be made, and he wrote to the King of France, the Duke of Burgundy, and other monarchs, asking for their assistance in the work of reducing the Jews to that condition of slavery which was their due. He decreed in his general Church Council that Jews should be excluded in future from public offices, and that they should wear a badge to distinguish them from Christians; and he renewed the old regulation of the Church, which required them to dismiss Christian servants from their houses. In order to ensure that the last provision should be observed, he decided that any Christians having any intercourse with Jews that transgressed it should be subject to excommunication. For the enforcement of his other anti-Jewish measures he relied on the help of the temporal power in all Christian countries.¹

The declaration of war made by Innocent III. was a terrible calamity for the Jews; but though it affected at

¹ Letters of Innocent (Migne, *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus*, Vols. 214-217); Lib. VII., 186; Lib. VIII., 50, 121; Lib. X., 61, 190; *Corpus Juris Canonici* (Leipzig, 1839), II., 747-8; Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VII., 7, 8; Depping, *Les Juifs dans le Moyen Age*, 183; Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer*, III., 6, 7; Hurter, *Geschichte Papst Innocenz der Dritten*, II., 234; Güdemann, *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens, u.s.w.*, I., 37; Rule, *History of the Inquisition*, I. 10, 17.

once the whole of Christian Europe, still its evil results might have passed away in time. Popes were but men and politicians; and just as Innocent had, by the publication of his wishes and decrees concerning the Jews, set himself in opposition to his predecessors, so might his successors, in their turn, moved by different feelings or taking a different view of the interests and duties of the Church, set themselves in opposition to him, and go back to the old lenient opinions and practice. But within a few years of the death of Innocent, the work of attacking the Jews ceased to be in the hands of any one man, and passed over to a body of men habitually influenced not by personal or political considerations, but only by what they conceived to be the interest of religion, and filled with a hatred of the Jews more fierce and fanatical and steadfast than that of the Popes could ever have been.

The Dominican order was formally constituted in 1223, and from the earliest years of its existence devoted itself to the task of rooting out unbelief from the Christian world. The work that its members at first professed to regard as peculiarly their own was that of preaching, but on the Jews their preaching had no effect. With an ingenuity and determination worthy of the order that in a later century was to provide the Inquisition with its chief ministers, the Dominicans devised and carried out another plan of action. Assisted by converted Jews who had joined them, they undertook the study of Hebrew, and their master, Raymundus de Peñaforte, induced the King of Spain to build and endow seminaries for the purpose.¹ Armed with this new knowledge, they were able to attack, first, what they represented as the foolish and pernicious contents of such Jewish books as the Talmud, and secondly, the stubbornness of the Jews who refused to accept the doctrines of Christianity, the truth of which the Dominicans professed to be able to demonstrate from the Old Testament. Two incidents which must at the

¹ Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VII., 27.

time have been famous throughout Europe illustrate their method of warfare. In 1239 Nicolas Donin, a converted Jew who had become a Dominican friar, laid before Gregory IX. a series of statements concerning the Talmud. Helped, no doubt, by all the influence of his order, he induced the Pope to issue bulls to the Kings of France, England, and Spain, and the bishops in those countries, ordering that all copies of the Talmud should be seized, and that public inquiry should be held concerning the charges brought against the book. In England and Spain nothing seems to have been done, but in Paris the Pope's instructions were carried out, and, at the instigation of the leading Dominicans, St. Louis ordered that all copies of the Talmud that could be found in France should be confiscated, and that four Rabbis should, on behalf of the Jews, hold a public debate with Donin, in order to meet, if they could, the charges that he was prepared to maintain. In the course of the debate, which was held in the precincts of the Court and in the presence of members of the Royal family and great dignitaries of the Church, Donin asserted that the Talmud encouraged the Jews to despise, deceive, rob, and even murder Christians, that it contained blasphemous falsehoods concerning Christ, superstitions and puerilities of all kinds, and passages disrespectful to God and inconsistent with morality. The Rabbis answered as best they could, but the court of Inquisitors decided that the charges had been substantiated, and ordered that all the confiscated copies of the Talmud should be burnt. After a delay of about two years the *Auto-da-fe* took place, and fourteen cartloads of the Talmud were sacrificed.¹ The other famous incident of the kind took place in Spain. Pablo Christiano, a converted Jew, who, like Donin, had joined the Dominicans, challenged the Jews of Aragon to a discussion on the differences between Judaism and Chris-

¹ *Révue des Etudes Juives*, I. 247, 293 ; II. 248 ; III. 39 ; Noel Valois, *Guillaume d'Auvergne*, pp. 118, 137.

tianity, and induced James I. to compel them to take up the challenge. The famous Nachmanides came forward as the representative of his co-religionists. Pablo undertook to show that the Old Testament, and other books recognised by the Jews, taught that the Messiah had come, that he was "very God and very man," that he suffered and died for the salvation of mankind, and that with his advent the ceremonial law ceased to be of any effect. Nachmanides denied that any of these propositions could be substantiated from the Jewish sacred books. For four days the disputation was carried on in the presence of the king and many great personages of Church and State. Of course the verdict was that the Christian disputant had beaten the Jew.¹

The method of conducting these two controversies showed that the Dominicans were determined to use every possible weapon against the Jews. The Talmud, a huge, heterogeneous and unedited compilation, contains passages which are trivial and foolish, and others, written by men who had memories of persecution fresh in their minds, which express bitter hatred towards the "Gentiles," that is, the Romans who had taken Jerusalem, and had destroyed the nationality of the Jewish race. It was easy for an opponent to pick out such passages, to assert that what was said against the "Gentiles" expressed, not the feelings of the victims of persecution against the Romans of the second century, but the feelings of all Jews towards all non-Jews, at every time and at every place, and to convince an uncritical audience that those who held in honour the book that contained such passages were enemies of religion, against whose influence it behoved all Christian powers to guard the faithful. Similarly, by compelling the Jews to take part in a discussion concerning the prophecies of the Old Testament, the Dominicans imposed on them the choice between the two alternatives of betraying their religion by

¹ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, XXVII., 562-3; Graetz, *Geschichte*, VII., 131, 135.

acquiescing in what they believed to be a false interpretation of their scripture, or else of proclaiming publicly their disbelief in doctrines which were at the very foundation of Christianity. The effect on the ruling classes in Europe of the two discussions just mentioned must have been very great. And the Dominicans were continually carrying on the same work, though, of course, seldom before audiences so distinguished. Pablo, for example, travelled about Spain and Provence, compelling the Jews, by virtue of a royal edict that had been issued in his favour, to hold disputes with him on matters of religion.¹ Many other members of the order devoted their lives to the same pursuit,² and thus did their best to fill the rulers of the Church with a dread of the terrible consequences that the existence of Judaism threatened to the Christian religion.

And, unfortunately for the Jews, their religion began to be feared at the same time as cruel and powerful fanatics like Innocent and the Dominicans were doing their best to cause it to be hated. There is good reason to believe, though detailed evidence is not abundant, that towards the end of the Middle Ages Judaism exercised over the superstitions of other faiths the same fascination as in the first century of the Roman Empire. Thomas Aquinas believed that unrestricted intercourse between Jews and Christians was likely to result in the conversion of Christians to Judaism, and for that reason he thought it right, in spite of the general liberality of his opinions concerning the Jews, that intercourse with them should be allowed to such Christians alone as were strong in the faith, and were more likely to convert them than to be converted by them.³ "It happens sometimes," wrote a Pope of the thirteenth century, "that Christians, when they are visited by the Lord with sickness and tribulation, go astray, and have recourse

¹ Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VII., 135; J. Jacobs, *Inquiry into the Sources of the History of the Jews in Spain*, xviii., 18.

² *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Quétif and Echard), I., 246, 396, 398, 594.

³ Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiæ*, Secunda Secundæ, Quæstio X.

to the vain help of the Jewish rite. They hold in the synagogues of the Jews torches and lighted candles, and make offerings there. Likewise they keep vigils (especially on the Sabbath), in the hope that the sick may be restored to health, that those at sea may reach harbour, that those in childbirth may be safely delivered, and that the barren may become fruitful and rejoice in offspring. For the accomplishment of these and other wishes, they implore the help of the said rite, and in idolatrous fashion show open signs of devotion and reverence to a scroll, not without much harm to the orthodox faith, contumely to our Creator, and opprobrium and shame to the Universal Church.”¹

The anti-Jewish feeling that grew up from the causes that have just been described called into existence new institutions and measures designed for the purpose of humbling the Jews and checking the growth of Judaism. In compliance with the cruel request of Innocent, most of the monarchs of Europe compelled their Jewish subjects to wear a badge.² Local church councils, which hitherto had contented themselves with the attempt to enforce the old prohibition against the employment by Jews of Christian servants and nurses, now went further, and forbade Christians to allow the presence of Jews in their houses and taverns, to feast or dance with them, to be present at the celebration of their marriages, their new moons, and their festivals, and to employ their services as doctors.³ The Popes of the latter part of the thirteenth century appointed Dominicans in various countries of Europe to perform the duty of preaching to the Jews, and of holding inquisitions into their heresies, in the hope that with the help of the secular power they might stamp them out.⁴

In England the relation of the Jews to the Christians underwent somewhat the same changes as in Continental

¹ Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (ed. Theiner), XIII., 87.

² *Revue des Etudes Juives*, VI. 81 ; VII. 94.

³ Mansi, *Concilia*, XXIII., 1174-6 ; Martène, *Thesaurus*, IV., 769.

⁴ Deeping, 198 ; Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer*, III., 13 ; Rule, *History of the Inquisition*, I. 27, 80, 81, 91, 332, 335-6.

Europe. Before the thirteenth century the Jews in England had, as has been said above, been free from molestation by the Church,¹ and their chief danger had been from the brutality and greed of the disorderly populace, of desperate outcasts, and of marauding Crusaders.² The first great attack made on them by any constituted power came from Stephen Langton, who, not content with passing at his Provincial Synod a decree which, in accordance with the regulations of Innocent, enforced the use of the badge and prohibited the erection of new synagogues, went so far as to issue orders that no one in his diocese should presume, under pain of excommunication, to have any intercourse with Jews, or should sell them any of the necessaries of life. The Bishops of Lincoln and Norwich issued the same orders in their dioceses.³ Many other bishops in the reign of Henry III. did their best, partly by legislation in their diocesan synods and partly by the use of their personal and spiritual influence, to check intercourse between Jews and Christians.⁴ Of course the king's guardians, in the interest of the royal income, a considerable part of which was derived from the Jewry, interfered to prevent the measures of Langton and his colleagues from being carried into effect. And Henry, when he took into his own hands the work of government, while, on the one hand, he showed his sympathy with the fears of the Church by building a house for the reception of Jewish converts,⁵ and by lending the sanction of the civil power to the decree that ordered the use of the badge,⁶ nevertheless followed the example that his guardians had set, and protected the Jews against the aggression of the Church.

¹ *Supra*, p. 428.

² *Supra*, pp. 82, 83, 89.

³ Wilkins, *Magnæ Britannię Concilia*, I., 591; Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 83; Rye, *History of Norfolk*, 87.

⁴ Wilkins, *Magnæ Britannię Concilia*, I., 657, 693, 719; *Letters of Bishop Grosseteste* (Rolls Series), 318.

⁵ Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora*, III., 262.

⁶ Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 148.

There were many reasons which might have caused Edward to sympathise more strongly than his father had done, with the anti-Jewish feelings of the Church. He was a pious man and a pious king, filled with a sense of his kingly duty towards "the living God who takes to himself the souls of Princes."¹ He was a Crusader, though the great crusading age was over, a founder of monasteries, a pilgrim to holy places; and through his confessors he was in close connection with, and under the influence of, the Dominican order.² Some of his bishops were determined enemies of the Jews. John of Peckham, for example, the Archbishop of Canterbury, insisted at one time on the demolition of all the small private synagogues in London, at which the Jews were in the habit of worshipping after the confiscation of their great public synagogues at the end of the reign of Henry III.; at another time he demanded from the king the help of the temporal power against Jews who having once been converted to Christianity, wished to go back to their old faith; on another occasion he took the bold step of writing to the Queen concerning her business transactions with the Jews, solemnly warning her that unless she gave them up she could never be absolved from her sins, "nay, not though an angel should assert the contrary."³ At Hereford, Bishop Swinfield was so determined to prevent intercourse with Jews that, when he heard that certain Christians intended to be present at a marriage feast to be given by some rich Jews of the city, he issued a proclamation threatening with excommunication any who should carry out their intention, and, when his proclamation was disregarded, he carried out his threat.⁴

¹ Rymer, *Fædera*, I., 743.

² Tout, *Edward I.*, pp. 69, 149.

³ John of Peckham, *Registrum Epistolarum* (Rolls Series), I., 239; II., 407; III., 937; Wilkins, *Magnæ Britanniae Concilia*, II., 88-9; Prynne, *Second Demurrer*, 121-2.

⁴ *Household Roll of Bishop Swinfield* (Camden Society), pp. c., ci.

Certain events that happened, or were said to have happened, in England in Edward's lifetime, some, indeed, under his own observation, may well have seemed to him to justify the attitude of the Church. In 1275 a Dominican friar was converted to Judaism.¹ In 1268, while Edward was in Oxford, the Chancellor, masters and scholars of the University, and the Parochial Clergy, were going in procession to visit the shrine of St. Friedswide when, according to a story that gained general credence, a Jew of the city snatched from the bearer a cross that was being carried at their head and trod it under foot.² At Norwich, early in Edward's reign, a Jew was burnt for blasphemy.³ At Nottingham, in 1278, a Jewess was charged with abusing in scandalous terms all the Christian bystanders in the market-place.⁴

Edward's conduct could not but be influenced by the general tone of opinion in the Church, by the strong anti-Jewish feeling of some of his bishops, and by the follies, real or supposed, of the Jews themselves. In continuation of his father's policy he made, throughout his reign, such contributions as, with his scanty means, he could afford, to the support of the House of Converts.⁵ He renewed the edict concerning the wearing of the badge, and extended it to Jewesses, whereas it had formerly applied only to Jews.⁶ In order that the Dominicans might be able to carry on in England the same efforts at conversion as they were already pursuing in France, Spain and Germany, he issued to all the sheriffs and bailiffs in England writs bidding them do their best so induce all

¹ Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden*, VII., note 11. *Florence of Worcester* (English Historical Society), II., 214.

² Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 168.

³ *Forty-ninth Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, p. 187.

⁴ *Forty-seventh Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, p. 306.

⁵ *Dictionary of Political Economy*, Article, "Jews (House for Converted)."

⁶ Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 208.

the Jews in the counties and towns under their charge to assemble and hear the word of God preached by the friars.¹ To meet the danger to religion that might arise from the blasphemous utterances of Jews, he ordered that proclamation should be made throughout England that any Jew found guilty (after an enquiry conducted by Christians) of having spoken disrespectfully of Christ, the Virgin Mary, or the Catholic faith, should be liable to the loss of life or limbs.²

Thus far Edward was prepared to go, and no farther. He believed that the Jews, so long as they remain Jews, lived in ignorance and sin, and he did what he could to help the friars in the effort to convert them. He believed that some among them were likely to make blasphemous attacks on Christianity, and he did what he could to keep them in check. But he believed that it was possible for them to live in peace and quietness, carrying on trades and handicrafts, among Christian neighbours in Christian towns. And it was to enable them to do so that he adopted the policy of 1275, and bade the Jews renounce usury, giving them at the same time permission "to practise trade, to live by their labour, and, for those purposes, freely to converse with Christians." But, as we have seen, there were imposed on the Jews who attempted to avail themselves of this permission, legal disadvantages which wholly unfitted them for industrial competition with non-Jews, and compelled them to continue the practice of usury. That Edward recognised this fact is shown by the issue of the revised Statute of Usurers some years after 1275; but that measure was inconclusive and inconsistent with the rest of his policy. Sooner or later the conclusion would have forced itself on him that until the Jews were, by the acquisition of the right to become burgesses and guildsmen, enabled to enter into industrial

¹ *Forty-ninth Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, p. 95; Rymer, *Fœdera*, I., 576; Madox, *Exchequer*, I., 259.

² Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, p. 208.

competition on equal terms with Christians, all his efforts to make them traders instead of usurers would be wasted. He would then have had before him two alternatives. He might, on the one hand, have declined to sacrifice his seignorial rights over the Jews, whom he had described in the Statute of 1275 as "talliable to the king as his own serfs, and not otherwise," and in that case he would have had to recognise that his whole Jewish policy was an impossible one. Or he might, on the other hand, have revoked the provision in the statute which forbade the Jews to be in "scots, lots, or talliage with the other inhabitants of those cities or burgesses where they remained." Such a measure would have been a step in the only direction which could possibly lead to the success of his policy. But it would not by itself have been enough to secure success; for, when the legal difficulties of the Jews had been removed, there would still have remained the social difficulties which proceeded from the dislike in which they were held by the Church and the people; and, unless these difficulties also could be removed, so that the Jews might be in a position of social equality, as well as legal equality, with Christians, and associate with them in friendly intercourse, the king's policy would be as far from success as ever. Which alternative Edward would have decided to adopt is, of course, a question we have no means of answering; but the decision was taken out of his hands by the interference, for the first and last time in English history, of the head of the Catholic Church in the relations between the Jews and the king.

At the end of 1286, Honorius IV. addressed to the Archbishops of Canterbury¹ and York² and their suffragans the following bull:—

"We have heard that in England the accursed and perfidious Jews have done unspeakable things and horrible acts, to the shame of our Creator and the detriment of the

¹ Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici* (ed. Theiner), XIII., 10, 11.

² *Révue des Etudes Juives*, I., 298.

Catholic faith. They are said to have a wicked and deceitful book, which they commonly call Thalmud, containing manifold abominations, falsehoods, heresies, and abuses. This damnable work they continually study, and with its nefarious contents their base thoughts are always engaged. Moreover, they set their children from their tender years to study its lethal teaching, and they do not scruple to tell them that they ought to believe in it more than in the Law of Moses, so that the said children may flee from the path of God and go astray in the devious ways of the unbelievers. Moreover, they not only attempt to entice the minds of the faithful to their pestilent sect, but also, with many gifts, they seduce to apostasy those who, led by wholesome counsel, have abjured the error of infidelity and betaken themselves to the Christian faith; so that some, being led away by the treachery of the Jews, live with them according to their rite and law, even in the parishes in which they received new life from the sacred font of baptism; and hence arise injury to our Saviour, scandal to the faithful, and dishonour to the Christian faith. Some also who have been baptised they send to other places, in order that there they may live unknown and return to their disbelief. They invite and urgently persuade Christians to attend their synagogues on the Sabbath and on other of their solemn occasions, to hear and take part in their services, and to show reverence to the parchment-scroll or book in which their law is written, in consequence of which many Christians Judaize with the Jews.

“Moreover, they have in their households Christians whom they compel to busy themselves on Sundays and feast-days with servile tasks from which they should refrain. And so they cast opprobrium on the majesty of God. They have in their houses Christian women to bring up their children. Christian men and women dwell among them; and so it often happens, when occasion offers and the time is favourable to shameful actions, that Christian

men have unblessed intercourse with Jewish women and Christian women with Jewish men.

"Yet Christians and Jews go on meeting in each others' houses. They spend their leisure in banqueting and feasting together, and hence the opportunity for mischief becomes easy. On certain days they publicly abuse Christians, or rather curse them, and do other wicked acts which offend God and cause the loss of souls.

"And although some of you have been often asked to devise a fitting remedy for these things, yet you have failed to comply. Whereat we are forced to wonder the more, since the duty of your pastoral office binds you to show yourselves more ready and determined than other men to avenge the wrongs of our Saviour, and to oppose the nefarious attempts of the foes of the Christian faith.

"An evil so dangerous must not be made light of, lest, being neglected, it may grow great. You are bound to rise up with ready courage against such audacity in order that it may be completely suppressed and confounded and that the dignity and glory of the Catholic Faith may increase. Therefore by this apostolic writing we give orders that, as the duty of your office demands, you shall use inhibitions, spiritual and temporal penalties and other methods, which shall seem good to you, and which in your preaching and at other fitting times you shall set forth, to the end, that this disease may be checked by proper remedies. So may you have your reward from the mercy of the Eternal King. We shall extol in our prayers your wisdom and diligence. Let us know fully by your letters what you do in this matter."

X.—THE EFFECTS OF THE CLERICAL OPPOSITION.

Edward was too religious to disregard the wishes of the Pope, expressed thus formally and solemnly and with the utmost strength of language. And he had special reasons for paying heed to the words of Honorius IV., on whose money-lenders he was dependent for loans, and whose

predecessor had, by the exercise of his spiritual powers, secured for him a tenth part of the goods of the clergy of England.¹ From the moment of the issue of the bull, the policy inaugurated by the statute of 1275 was doomed. For of the two alternatives that Edward would have had before him in any further Jewish legislation that he might have undertaken—the alternatives of the abandonment of the policy of 1275, or the extension of it by further measures for the assimilation of the status of Jews to that of Christians—the Church now demanded that he should at once adopt the former. It demanded that the Jews of England should live isolated from the Christians; and this they could do only so long as they kept to pursuits, such as usury, for the practice of which they required no connection with the organisation of a gild or a town.

For a time Edward could take no decisive measures, since when the bull reached England, he had left for Gascony.² In that province nothing had apparently as yet been done to satisfy the demand made by the Council of Lyons, in 1274, that alien usurers should no longer be tolerated in the land of Christians. It was hopeless to try to enforce in a distant dependency the policy that had been beset in England with so many difficulties, and had now incurred the direct opposition of the Church. The only alternative was expulsion, a measure that on French soil suggested itself the more naturally, since two French kings had practically adopted it already. Before he returned home, Edward issued an order that all Jews should leave Gascony.³

The application of the same measure in England was a more serious matter, since the English Jews were doubtless a much larger community than those of Gascony. But, determined not to tolerate them as usurers, and convinced

¹ Rymer, I., 560-1.

² Edward left England May, 1286. *Florence of Worcester* (English Historical Society), II., 236.

³ *Willelmi Rishanger Chronica et Annales* (Rolls Series), 116; *Flores Historiarum* (Rolls Series), III., 70-71.

of the hopelessness of his efforts to change them into traders, Edward had no alternative but to treat them as he had treated their coreligionists in Gascony.

No doubt he was influenced in his resolution by the members of his family and court. His wife and mother and various of his officers had been in the habit of receiving liberal grants from the property and forfeitures of the Jews.¹ They must have known that this resource was decreasing steadily, and was not worth husbanding, and they must have welcomed a measure which would bring into the King's hands a fairly large amount of spoil capable of immediate distribution. And, probably, some of the ecclesiastical members of the court felt, as his mother certainly did,² a religious hatred of the Jews and a religious joy at the prospect of their disappearance.

XI.—THE EXPULSION.

Of the course of events for the first few months after Edward's return to England, very meagre accounts have come down to us. His searching inquiry into the conduct of the judges during his absence³ must have taken up most of his time and energy. As soon as he had meted out punishment to those whom he had found guilty of corruption, he turned to the Jewish question. On the 18th of July, 1290, writs were issued to the sheriffs of counties, informing them that a decree had been passed that all Jews should leave England before the feast of All Saints of that year.⁴ Any who remained in the country

¹ *Forty-second Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, 593; *Forty-fourth Report*, 109, 295; *Forty-fifth Report*, 72, 163; *Forty-ninth Report*, 81; *Calendar of Patent Rolls from 1281 to 1292*, 62, 193; *Archæologia*, VI., 339; Madox, *History of the Exchequer*, I. 225 w; 230 b; 231 l; John of Peckham, *Registrum Epistolarum*, II. 619; III., 937; Rogers, *Oxford City Documents* (Oxford Historical Society), 208, 219; Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 200.

² Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* (Second Edition), VII., note 11.

³ *Chronicles of Edward I. and Edward II.* (Rolls Series), I., 97; *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft* (Rolls Series), II., 185-6.

⁴ Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 240.

after the prescribed day were declared liable to the penalty of death.¹

Every effort was made by the King to secure the peace and safety of the Jews during the short period for which they were allowed to remain, and in the course of their journey from their homes to the coast, and from the coast to their ultimate destination. The sheriffs were ordered to have public proclamation made that "no one within the appointed period should injure, harm, damage, or grieve them," and were to ensure, for such as chose to pay for it, a safe journey to London. The wardens of the Cinque Ports, within the district of whose jurisdiction many of the Jews would necessarily embark, received orders of the same spirit as those that had been addressed to the sheriffs of the counties. They were to see that the exiles were provided, after payment, with a safe and speedy passage across the sea, and that the poor among them were enabled to travel at cheap rates and were treated with consideration.² These general orders were reinforced by the issue of special writs of safe-conduct for individual Jews.³ The exiles were allowed to carry with them all of their own property that was in their possession at the time of the issue of the decree of expulsion, together with such pledges deposited with them by Christians as were not redeemed before a fixed date. A few Jews who were high in the favour of royal personages, such as Aaron, son of Vives, who was a "chattel" of the King's brother Edmund,⁴ and Cok, son of Hagin, who belonged to the Queen,⁵ were allowed before their departure to sell their houses and fees to any Christian who would buy them.

On St. Denis's Day all the Jews of London started on their journey to the sea-coast.⁶ The treatment that they met with was not so merciful as the king had wished.

¹ *Bartholomæi de Cotton, Historia Anglicana* (Rolls Series), p. 178.

² Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, 240-2.

³ *Ib.* 241; *Calendar of Patent Rolls from 1281 to 1292*, 378, 381, 382.

⁴ *Ib.* 379.

⁵ *Ib.* 384.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 232.

Many of the richer among them embarked with all their property at London. At the mouth of the Thames, the master cast anchor during the ebb-tide, so that his vessel grounded on the sands, and invited his passengers to walk on the shore till it was again afloat. He led them to a great distance, so that they did not get back till the tide was again full. Then he ran into the water, climbed into the ship by means of a rope, and bade them, if they needed help, call on their Prophet Moses. They followed him into the water, and most of them were drowned. The sailors appropriated all that the Jews had left on board. But subsequently the master and his accomplices were indicted, convicted of murder, and hanged.¹

One body of the exiles set sail for France. During their voyage fierce storms swept the sea. Many were drowned. Many were cast destitute on the coast that they were seeking, and were allowed by the King to live for a time in Amiens.² This act of mercy, however, called forth the censure of the Pope, and the *Parlement de la Chandeleur*, which met in the same year, decreed that all the Jews from England and Gascony that had taken refuge in the French king's dominions should leave the country by the middle of the next Lent.³ Another body, numbering 1,335, and consisting, to a great extent, of the poor, went to Flanders.⁴ The only known fact that we have to guide our conjectures as to the ultimate place of settlement of any of those who left England is that, in a list of the inhabitants of the Paris Jewry, made four years after the Expulsion, there appear certain names with the additions of *l'Englische* or *l'Englais*.⁵ It may well be that many Jews

¹ Walter of Hemingburgh, *Chronicon* (English Historical Society), I., 21, 22; Bartholomæus Cotton, *Historia Anglicana* (Rolls Series), 178; *Annales Monastici*, III., 362, IV., 327.

² *Opus Chronicorum* in *Chronicles of S. Albans*, J. de Trokelowe, etc., *Annales* (Rolls Series), 57.

³ Laurière, *Ordonnances des Rois de la France*, I., 317.

⁴ Fortieth Report of Deputy-Keeper of Public Records, p. 474.

⁵ *Revue des Etudes Juives*, Vol. I., pp. 66, 67, 69.

from England, speaking the French language, were able, in spite of the Act of the *Parlement de la Chandeleur*, to become merged in the general body of the Jews of France, who were many times as numerous as those of England had been.¹ Many, too, may have thrown in their lot with their 850,000 coreligionists of Spain.²

The property that they left behind them in England consisted of such dwelling-houses, and other houses, as remained to them in spite of the strict conditions imposed by the Statute of 1275, of the synagogues and cemeteries of their local congregations, and of bonds partly for the repayment of money, and partly for the delivery of wool and corn for which the price had been paid in advance. All fell into the hands of the King,³ except, possibly, the houses in some of those towns, such as Hereford, Winchester, and Ipswich, of which the citizens had by the purchase of manorial rights become entitled to all fines and forfeitures.⁴ The annual value of the houses, as shown in the returns made by the sheriffs, was, after allowance had been made for the right of the Capital Lords, about £130. The value of the debts, as shown in the register made by the officers of the Exchequer, was about £9,100, but the amount for realisation was diminished by the King's resolve to take from the debtors, not the full amount for which they were liable, and which, under the amended statute of the Jewry,⁵ could include three years' interest, but only the bare principal that had been originally advanced. Even this was not fully collected; payment was, by the King's permission, delayed, and confirmations,

¹ Graetz, VII., 267.

² *Ibid.*, 155.

³ Langtoft, II., 189; Hemingburgh, II., 21; Madox, *Exch.*, I., 261.

⁴ Johnson, *Customs of Hereford*, p. 100; Madox, *Firma Burgi*, 12, 19, 23. I am not at all confident of the accuracy of Mr. Johnson's statement, on which the latter half of this sentence is founded. Certainly some of the houses of the Jews of Hereford, Winchester, and Ipswich, were granted away by the king (*Lansdowne MSS.*, British Museum, Vol. 826, part 5, Transcript 4, *Rotuli Originalium* (Record Commission), I., 73b-76a.

⁵ *Papers Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, p. 230.

made in 1315 and 1327, of the renunciation of interest, show how long some of the debts remained outstanding. Edward III. finally gave up the claim to all further payment.¹

It was ordered that the houses should be sold and the proceeds devoted to pious uses.² But it appears that they were nearly all given away to the King's friends.³

XII.—THE NECESSITY OF THE EXPULSION.

The Expulsion was not the act of a cruel king. The forbearance which marks the orders to the officers who were charged with the execution of the decree had been shown by Edward many a time before, when he protected Jews against claims too rigorously enforced, and ordered that his own rights should be waived where insistence on them would have deprived his debtors of their means of subsistence.⁴

Nor was it prompted by greed. It is true that immediately after it, and according to the account of many chroniclers, as an expression of gratitude for it, the Parliament voted a tenth and a fifteenth.⁵ But this can-

¹ *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, I, 346*b*; II., 8*a*, 402*a*; *Statutes of Realm*, 1 Ed. III., Stat. 2, § 3.

² Tovey, 235; Prynn, *Second Demurrer*, 127; *Papers, Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, 21.

³ A list not quite complete, of the houses belonging to the expelled Jews is contained in the Manuscript known as *Q. R. Miscellanea*: "Jews," No. 557, 9 and 11 (Public Record Office). A list of persons who received from the King-grants of Jews' houses, to hold at a nominal rental, is printed in *Rotulorum Originalium Abbrevisatio* (Record Commission) pp. 73^a-76^b, and the deeds of gift are copied in full in *Lansdowne MSS.* (British Museum) Vol. 826, Part 5, Transcript 4. Nearly all the houses mentioned in *Q. R. Miscellanea* are granted away by deeds included in the *Rotuli Originalium* and the Lansdowne Transcript.

⁴ Madox, *Exch.* I. 2, 248*h*, 258*i*, etc.; Tovey, 207; Prynn, *2nd Ten.* 59, 76; Rymer, *Fœdera*, 523, 598.

⁵ *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa* (Rolls Series), II., 251-2. *Annales Monastici*, III., 362; W. de Hemingburgh, *Chronicon* (English Historical Society) II., 22.

not have been a bribe offered beforehand, for the writs announcing the decree were issued on the fourth day after that for which the Parliament was summoned.¹ It is impossible to suppose that in so short an interval the question was brought up, the policy chosen, the price fixed, and the decree issued. It is equally impossible that Edward's conduct should have been affected by the prospect of the confiscation of the small amount of property that the Jews left behind them.

The Expulsion was a piece of independent royal action, made necessary by the impossibility of carrying out the only alternative policy that an honourable Christian king could adopt. And the impossibility was not of Edward's making. It was the result of many causes, and the knowledge of it had been brought home to him by many proofs. The guesses of our contemporary, and all but contemporary, authorities who take on themselves to explain his action, show how many were the obstacles before which he had to confess himself vanquished. In one chronicle the Expulsion is represented as a concession to the prayer of the Pope;² in another, as the result of the efforts of Queen Eleanor;³ in a third, as a measure of summary punishment against the blasphemy of the Jews, taken to give satisfaction to the English clergy;⁴ in a fourth as an answer to the complaints made by the magnates of the continued prevalence of usury;⁵ in a fifth as an act of conformity to public opinion;⁶ in a sixth, as a reform suggested by the King's independent general enquiry into the administration of the kingdom during his absence,

¹ Parliament was summoned for July 15th; see Parliamentary Paper 69; of 1878 (H. of C.) "Parliaments of England"; the writs ordering the Expulsion were issued on July the 18th; see Tovey, 240.

² French Chronicler of London, in Riley's *Chronicles of Old London*, 242.

³ *Annales Monastici*, II., 409.

⁴ *Ib.*, III., 361.

⁵ W. de Hemingburgh, II., 20.

⁶ *Chronicles of Edward I. and Edward II.* (Rolls Series) Vol. I. 99 ("Omnes Judæi concedente Rege Edwardo exulantur").

and his discovery, through the complaints of the Council, of the "deceits" of the Jews.¹

Each of these statements gives us some information as to the nature and extent of the failure of Edward's policy. None gives the true cause, for none sets before us the true position of the Jews and their relations with their neighbours. It is true that it was the bull of Honorius that finally compelled Edward to give up his attempt to assimilate the position of the Jews to that of Christian traders. It is true, no doubt, that his mother had from the first dissuaded him from generous treatment, and, perhaps, had induced him to lessen the chance of the success of his policy by asserting his right over them as over his serfs.² But the bull of the Pope and the personal influence of the Queen-mother were alike unnecessary. If Edward had waived all his rights, if the Church had in his reign relented towards the Jews instead of increasing its bitterness towards them, both acts of generosity would have come too late. The same causes that had made the Jews accept the position of royal usurers at the end of the eleventh century, and of royal chattels at the end of the twelfth, made it impossible for them to give up either position at the end of the thirteenth. From the moment of their arrival in England they had been hated by the common people. They never had an opportunity of acquiring interests in common with their neighbours, or of entering their social or industrial institutions. Isolation brought with it danger. For the sake of safety they had to accept royal protection; and their protectors long held them in a close grip, until one at last refused to tolerate them under the same conditions as had satisfied his predecessors. But to

¹ *The Chronicle of Pierre Langtoft* (Rolls Series), II., 187-89.

² Cum . . . concesserimus Karissimæ matri nostræ Aleanoræ Reginae Angliæ quod nullus Judæus habitet vel moretur in quibuscunque villis quas ipsa mater nostra habet in dotem. . . *Papers of the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, pp. 187-8. *Forty-fourth Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records*, p. 6. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* (Second edition), VII., note 11.

have given them their freedom would only have been to expose them to the old dislike and the old danger. If Edward had allowed them to become citizens, and had set at naught the bull of Honorius, he would have seen the English towns refusing to support his policy and denying to the Jews the right to join the gild merchant, to learn trades and to practise them, and to enjoy the protection of municipal laws and customs.

For towards all new-comers, of whatever race or religion, the English burgesses of the Middle Ages showed a spirit of unyielding exclusiveness.¹ But the feeling against the Jews was far greater than that against any other class. Every reference to them in English literature, before the Expulsion and long after it, shows its strength and bitterness. "Hell is without light where they sing lamentations," says one poet of them.² Another who, writing a few years after the Expulsion, mentions the massacre at the coronation of Richard I., finds in it nothing to wonder at, and nothing to regret. To him it is only natural that "The king took it for great shame That from such unclean things as them any meat to him came."³ The chroniclers of the time refer to them again and again, and always in the same tone of dislike. "The Jews," says Matthew Paris, in his account of one of the most cruel of Henry III.'s acts of extortion, "had nearly all their money taken from them, and yet they were not pitied, because it is proved, and is manifest, that they are continually convicted of forging charters, seals and coins."⁴ "They are a sign for the nation like Cain the accursed," he says elsewhere.⁵ The eulogist of Edward I., when he recounts the great deeds of his hero, tells with pride and

¹ Compare the treatment of the Flemings, who settled as weavers in different towns of England soon after the Conquest, but had to retreat to one district in Wales, where they lived under special royal protection. Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce*, 176; and see Gross, *Gild Merchant*, II., 155-6.

² Jacobs, 14.

³ *Ibid.*, 107.

⁴ *Historia Anglorum*, III., 76.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III., 103.

without a word of pity how "the perfidious and unbelieving horde of Jews is driven forth from England in one day into exile.¹ And just as no punishment that they can suffer is regarded as too heavy for their sins, so no story of their misdoings, whether it be of the murder of Christian children, of insults to the Christian religion, or of fraud on Christian debtors, is too improbable or too brutal or too trivial to be repeated.²

The popular hatred showed itself in deed as well as in word. The massacres of 1190 were imitated on a small scale at intervals during the sojourn of the Jews in England. Bradiers and hosiers bakers and shoemakers, tailors and copperers, priests and Oxford scholars were all ready to take part in the looting of a Jewry.³

Nor was there any influence exercised by the higher classes to make the populace less intolerant.⁴ A great lady declared that it was a disgrace for one of her rank to sit in a carriage in which a Jewess had sat. A great noble thought it a good jest, when a Jew on his estate fell into a pit on a Friday, to order that he should not be helped out either on the Jewish Sabbath or on the Christian, in order that the absurdity of the Mosaic legislation might be demonstrated—at the cost, as it resulted, of the Jew's life.⁵

Bishops supported with eagerness the charge of child-murder repeatedly brought against the Jews,⁶ though Popes and Councils had declared it to be groundless⁷; and the judge who showed the greatest eagerness for the punish-

¹ *Chronicles of Edward I. and Edward II.* (Rolls Series), *Commendatio Lamentabilis*, II., 14.

² M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, V., 114; *Annales Monastici*, IV., 503; *Gesta Abbatum Monasterii, S. Albani* (Rolls Series), I., 471.

³ *Annales Monastici*, IV., 91; *Norfolk Antiquarian Miscellany*, I., 331; *Forty-fourth Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, 188; *De Antiquis Legibus*, Camden Soc., 50; Tovey, 156; Prynne, *Second Demurrer*, 118.

⁴ Jacobs, 26.

⁵ W. Rishanger, *Chronica et Annales* (Rolls Series), p. 4.

⁶ M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, IV. 30, 31.

⁷ Hahn, *Geschichte der Ketzer*, III., 35, n. 2.

ment of the Jewish prisoners who were accused on the monstrous charge of having murdered Hugh of Lincoln, was a man who was held in especial honour by his contemporaries as a scholar and a circumspect and discreet man.¹

Thus the Christians were not likely to endure the Jews as neighbours and fellow-workers, and the Jews, even if they had been permitted, would have been as little willing to live the life and follow the ordinary pursuits of citizens. It was not that they loved usury as a calling. On the contrary, they entered willingly into all those professions that gave them the opportunity of being their own masters and living according to their own fashion. Many of them were physicians, and among the most esteemed in Europe.² In Italy, where the municipal and gild organisations were easier to enter, and less narrow and exacting in their constitution, than those of England,³ they worked at trades.⁴ In Sicily, under Frederic II., some Jews were employed as administrators, and many more were agriculturists.⁵ In Rome, one was treasurer of the household of Pope Alexander III., and in Southern France another filled the same office under Count Raymond, of Toulouse.⁶ In Austria, they were the financial ministers of the Archduke,⁷ and in Spain, one was chamberlain to Alphonso the Wise, and many others were in the service of the same king.⁸ In England, some Jews were attached to the Court of Henry III., and treated with special favour; others were useful and valued adherents of Richard, King of the

¹ M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, V. 517; *Annales Monastici*, I. 345.

² *Révue des Études Juives*, XVIII., 258; *East Anglian*, V. 10; Jacobs, 88-9.

³ Perrens, *Histoire de Florence*, III., 220-1, 226. Gregorovius, *Gesch. der Stadt. Rom.*, V., 308.

⁴ Thomas Aquinas, *Opusculum*, XXI.

⁵ Güdemann, *Gesch. des Erziehungswesens*, etc., II., 287.

⁶ Güdemann, II., 71; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, XXVII., 520.

⁷ Graetz, VII., 97.

⁸ *Ib.*, 125-7.

Romans,¹ and, after the prohibition of usury, others, as we have seen, became corn-merchants, and wool-merchants.

But the whole character of the Jews, their religious beliefs, and their national hopes, were such as to make repellent to them those close relations with Christians and Englishmen which would have been necessary if they had entered into the feudal or municipal organisations of the Middle Ages. They could not, without violating their religion, eat at a Gild feast, or take part in its religious ceremonies. Their teachers, like those of the Church, warned them against social intercourse with the Christians, "lest it might lead to inter-marriage."² They did not speak the English language.³ They remained willingly outside the national and municipal life.

Their isolation caused them no sorrow. Rather must it have been dear to them as a sign that they were faithful members of the one race to which in truth they belonged, the race of Israel. The interests that filled their mind were those that were common to them, not with the inhabitants of the country in which they lived, but with their brethren in faith and race scattered throughout the world. The rapidity and copiousness with which the stream of Jewish literature poured forth in the Middle Ages, showed how unfailing was the strength of the Jewish life which was its source. In Southern Europe the Jews waged among themselves fierce controversies over problems such as were suggested by the support that some of their Rabbis gave, or appeared to give, to the Aristotelian doctrines of the eternity of matter and the uncreativity of God.⁴ Among the English Jews, and in the communities of Northern France with whom the English Jews were in continual communication, literature, though less contro-

¹ *Royal Letters* (Rolls Series), II., 46 ; Madox, I., 257 g ; Rymer, *Fœdera*, I., 356.

² Jacobs, 269.

³ JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IV. 12, 551 ; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, 27, 485, 650, *sq.*

⁴ *Hist. Litt. de France*, XXVII., 27, 650, *sq.*

versial and engaged with less deep questions, sufficed, nevertheless, even better to provide continual and engrossing interest for the orthodox. There were read and written, down to the last years before the Expulsion, commentaries and super-commentaries on the Bible and the Talmud, lexicons and grammars, treatises on ritual and ceremonial. The Rabbis discussed what blessings it was right to use on all the occasions of life, on rising in the morning, or on retiring to rest at night, on eating, on washing, on being married, on hearing thunder.¹ The English Jews were strict observers of the ceremonial law,² they made use in daily life of the minutiae of Rabbinical scholarship, they drew up their contracts "after the usage of the sages,"³ and thus, like all the Jews of mediæval Europe, they were continually reminded, in the pursuit of their ordinary interests and occupations, that they were a peculiar people. How proud they were of the position is shown by the poetical literature which, as preserved in the Jewish prayer book, is the most precious legacy that mediæval Judaism has left us. It was common to Jews in all lands; it commemorated all the sorrows of their nation, and gave expression to all their hopes. It made them feel that, scattered as they were, they yet had a destiny of their own, and it banished from their minds, as a counsel of baseness, the thought of making themselves one with the "Gentiles" around them. It reminded them that exile and persecution, and ultimate triumph were the appointed lot of Israel, and that the same teachers who had prophesied that the Chosen People should suffer, had also prophesied that in the fulness of time they should be redeemed. They knew that in the hour of danger and persecution there had never been wanting martyrs to testify in death to the unity of God and to the Glory of

¹ *Hist. Litt.*, 435, 441, 462, 484, 487, 507, *sq.*; JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IV., 25.

² Jacobs, 286.

³ *Archæological Journal*, XXVIII., 180.

his Name. And they could not doubt that the Lord of Mercy and Justice would mete out due recompense to the oppressors and the oppressed.¹

Thus the memory of their past, and the commonplace occurrences of their daily life, continually strengthened the bonds that bound Jews together after twelve centuries of dispersion. In the thirteenth century of the Christian era, as in the first, they still regarded the Holy Land as their true home. Three hundred Rabbis from France and England went thither in 1211.² There Jehudi Halevi ended his days.³ There Nachmanides taught that it was the duty of every Jew to live, and, true to his own lesson, he set out on his pilgrimage in the seventieth year of his age. And in his own and the next generation many Jews from Spain and Germany followed his example.⁴ A Jewish traveller of the Middle Ages says of certain of the communities of his coreligionists that he visited: "They are full of hopes, and they say to one another, 'Be of good cheer, brethren, for the salvation of the Lord will be quick as the glancing of an eye:' and were it not that we have hitherto doubted, and thought that the end of our Captivity has not yet arrived, we should have been gathered together long ago. But now this will not be till the time of song arrives, and the sound of the turtle-dove gives warning. Then will the message arrive, and we shall ever say 'The Name of the Lord be exalted.'"⁵

Nowhere in Europe could such men have been content to live the life of those around them, to bind themselves with the ties of citizenship, to find their highest hopes on earth in the destiny of the town, or the country, in which they dwelt. They were but sojourners. They lived in expectation of the time when the Lord should return the Captivity of Zion, and they should look back on their exile as awakened dreamers.

¹ Cf. L. Zunz, *Die Synagogale Poesie des Mittelalters*, Berlin, 1856.

² Graetz, VII., 6. ³ *Ibid.*, VI. ⁴ VII., 138; VII., 307-8; VII., 188-9.

⁵ Benjamin of Tudela, trans. Asher, I., 163.

Without the privilege of isolation they could not live; and if in England the communities of the Gentiles had been open to them, they would never have entered them.

The Expulsion of the English Jews was an event of small importance alike in English and in Jewish history. In England the effect that it produced was barely perceptible. The loss of their capital was too slight to produce any economic change. The only class that benefited from their departure was the Florentine merchants, whose trade grew from this time even greater than before.² Political results of importance have sometimes been attributed to the Expulsion. The victory of the towns over the King has been said to have been hastened by the loss of the financial support of the Jews.³ But it cannot have come any the sooner for the disappearance of a community from whom the King had long ceased to get any real help in his enterprises abroad, or in his struggles at home. The trading classes still complained after the Expulsion, as they had done before it, of the prevalence of the "horrible practice of usury, which has undone many, and brought many to poverty,"⁴ and the "horrible practice" prevailed none the less; and perhaps the poorer agricultural classes of England, the newly enfeoffed rent-payers, found, as did the corresponding class in France,⁵ that the expulsion of the Jews only compelled them to go to more cruel money-lenders than before. The coin was clipped as regularly after the Expulsion as before it, and the Christian goldsmiths were as rigorously treated as the Jewish money-

¹ See the Tables in Thorold Rogers' *History of Agriculture and Prices*, Vols. I. and II.

² Peruzzi, *Storia del Commercio e dei Banchieri de Firenze*, 175.

³ Papers, *Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition*, p. 211.

⁴ *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, II., 332-350.

⁵ Graetz, VII., 101.

lenders had been.¹ The Church, which had helped to drive out the Jews, soon found itself in conflict with Christian heresy, compared with which Jewish unbelief was harmless.

The Jews, on their side, were driven from a land which thirty-five years earlier they had begged in vain to be allowed to leave.² They went forth to join the far greater bodies of their countrymen in other lands, and with them to fulfil the career of sorrow that they had begun. The loss of their inhospitable home in England was but one episode in their tragic history. From France they were again to be expelled, despoiled and destitute.³ In Germany the blood-accusation met them as in England.⁴ In Spain popular massacres and clerical persecution were already preparing the ground for the Inquisition.⁵ The time was still far off when Jew and Christian could live side by side and neither suffer because he would not worship after his neighbour's fashion. That time could not come until society was more heterogeneous, and the circles of interest of ordinary men wider, than they could be in the thirteenth century, until the citizen ceased to live his life, bodily and spiritual, within the walls of his native town, under the shadow of the Church.

B. LIONEL ABRAHAMS.

¹ J. de Trokelowe, etc., *Chronica et Annales* (Rolls Series), 58; Ruding *Annals of the Coinage* (Third Edition), I., 198-202.

² M. Paris, *Chronica Majora*, V., 441, 487.

³ Graetz, VII., 264-7; Depping, 228-9.

⁴ Graetz, VII., 181-8, 252.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 163-4, 318-20, 363.